DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 123 027 RC 009 231

AUTHOR Miller, Michael V.; Kuvlesky, William P.
TITLE Status and Familial Projections of Mexican-American Migrants and Non-Migrants: Are Migrant Youths Different?
INSTITUTION Texas A and M Univ., College Station. Texas Agricultural Experiment Station.
SPONS AGENCY Cooperative State Research Service (DOA), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO TAES-RI-3286; USDA(CSRS)-NC-128
PUB DATE 29 Apr 76
NOTE 46p.; For related document, see ED 104 591. Paper presented at the Mexican American Studies Section, Annual Meetings of the Western Social Science Association (Tempe, Arizona, April 29, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Academic Aspiration; *Aspiration; Comparative Analysis; *Expectation; Family Planning; Females; Grade 10; High School Students; Males; *Mexican Americans; *Migrant Youth; Occupational Aspiration; Sex Differences; *Socioeconomic Status; Tables (Data); Values
IDENTIFIERS *Texas (South)

ABSTRACT

The study investigated whether Mexican American male and female migrants differed from Mexican American male and female non-migrants in reference to: level and type of occupational and educational aspirations and expectations; projected age of marriage and procreation; and valuation of life goals. Using data gathered in a 1973 survey of Mexican American high school sophomores residing in the South Texas towns of Asherton, Rio Grande City, Roma, San Isidro, and Zapata, this study's sample consisted of 67 male and 53 female migrant students and 99 male and 139 female non-migrants. The respondents' educational and occupational status projection specifications were initially coded into qualitative attainment types of status and then into more inclusive socioeconomic status type "level" categories. To indicate their valuation of life goals, respondents were asked to rank seven normally desired life ends in terms of their relative importance to him/her. Some findings were: no significant statistical variation was found between migrants and non-migrants (for both sexes) relative to occupational aspirations; the job expectations among female migrants were markedly lower than those for non-migrants; and regardless of migrant status and sex, the majority of youths desired to complete college and to attain high status level jobs. (NQ)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED123027

MAY 1976
ERIC / CRESS
RECEIVED

Status and Familial Projections of Mexican-American Migrants and Non-Migrants: Are Migrant Youths Different?

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Michael V. Miller

William P. Kuvlesky

Texas Agricultural Experiment Station

Texas A&M University

*Paper presented at the Mexican American Studies Section at the annual meetings of the Western Social Science Association, Tempe, Arizona, April 29, 1976. This report contributes to TAES project RI-3286, "Quality of Life as Influenced by Area of Residence" and to USDA-CSRS Regional Project NC-128. We acknowledge the assistance of David Wright and Esteban Salinas for their contributions in developing the instruments and in the collection of data.

RC009231

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to explore in a limited way the widely held belief that youths from migrant farm worker families are different from those of non-migrant Mexican-American families, using data gathered from a 1973 study of Mexican-American high school students residing in South Texas.

This effort represents the first of a series of analyses we are projecting relative to this problem and is intended to be a straight-forward, empirical, descriptive piece. Nevertheless, given the demonstrated lack of factual knowledge on this subject, we feel that the findings will make a contribution to knowledge about intragroup variability and will be of use to those concerned with Mexican-American migrant populations.

It is commonly believed among social scientists and others that Mexican-American farm migrant families are among the most socially and economically disadvantaged in our society.[1] However, in reading the literature purportedly describing this population, one often gets the impression that they closely approximate the ideal-type "culture of poverty" model.[2] To wit, due to the circumstances of migrant farm work and associated low economic returns, a subculture consisting of a general style of life maintains that is not conducive to providing children with the orientations, education, or skills required for vertical social mobility. Consequently, the migrant configuration (culture and group) tends to be perpetuated in almost an inherited way from one generation to another - "the cycle of poverty" notion. This pathological socio-cultural complex is often assumed to produce a "state of apathy" or hopelessness among farm migrant families, which impedes the development of mobility relevant motivation or ambition, and thus, tends to fix them in their disadvantaged situation.[3] Either the children will continue as migrant farm workers or, if they or the family "settles out," they will

represent a caste-like lower class in their new community setting.

We believe that the picture briefly sketched above is widely held among the members of our society and generally corresponds to the speculative and impressionistic statements found in the social science literature.[4] Is it a stereotype we have helped maintain and diffuse? If it is valid, one would clearly expect Mexican-American youth from farm migrant backgrounds to differ in some key respects from their ethnic counterparts. More specifically, it would seem logical to infer that migrant youth would have different perceptions and projections for future adult roles than others - lower level aspirations and expectations, for instance.[5] A recent report of research based on the data we are employing here indicates that migrant youth do differ from nonmigrant youth in reference to their orientations toward ethnic labels (Miller, 1976). As far as we can determine after a rather lengthy review of literature, no other research evidence of a comparative nature has been reported to provide a basis for an evaluation of this proposition. It is our intent to provide information that will make a start toward the accumulation of such evidence.

Conceptual Framework: Status Projections

The analysis to be reported is guided by a conceptual scheme taking off from Merton's previously noted idea of an "aspiration frame of reference" as modified and specified further by others as described below.

Some time ago Merton proposed that young people maintain a "frame of aspirational reference" composed of personal goals for status attainment as adults (Merton, 1957, pp. 132-133). This framework provides them with a cognitive map that serves to guide anticipatory socialization into adult roles. Ralph Turner (1964) has presented firm documentation for this assertion.

Merton conceived of only one frame of status projections, that involving

aspirations (desires). However, Stephenson (1957), among others, has demonstrated the utility of thinking in terms of two types of projections: in addition to aspirations, youth maintain a set of expectations (anticipations) which often differs from their desires. A conceptual scheme presented by Kuvlesky and Bealer (1966), begins with this analytical distinction between aspiration and expectation, and provides additional distinctions. The divergence, if any, between the desired and anticipated status objects within a particular area of potential status attainment (i.e., occupation) is labeled "anticipatory goal deflection" (Kuvlesky and Ohlendorf, 1968). Many youth indicate lower level expectations as compared with their level of aspiration, particularly in reference to occupational projections (Kuvlesky and Edington, 1976).

With few exceptions, the extensive body of research evidence accumulated over the last ten years on status projections of economically disadvantaged youth support Merton's general thesis: most disadvantaged youth, including those from rural areas and ethnic minority groups, do maintain high aspirations and expectations for status attainment relative to their families of origin and their realistic chances for social mobility (Kuvlesky and Monk, 1975; Kuvlesky and Juarez, 1975; Kuvlesky, Wright, and Juarez, 1971; Kuvlesky and Thomas, 1971; Edington, Pettibone, and Heldt, 1975; Crawford, 1975).

Research Objectives

Within the context of our data, the objective in this analysis is to determine whether or not Mexican-American adolescents from farm migrant backgrounds differ from their ethnic counterparts by sex in reference to projected status frames of reference. More specifically, we will attempt to determine whether or not differences exist among the Mexican-American males and females studied in reference to migrant vs. nonmigrant farm work experience relative to the

following status projections:

(1) Level and type of occupational aspirations and expectations

(2) Level and type of educational aspirations and expectations

(3) Projected age of marriage and procreation

(4) Valuation of life goals

Instruments and Measures

Here we present only a brief overview of the indicators and measurements utilized for the variables involved in our analysis. The stimulus questions used to produce responses and the measurement categories utilized for each variable are presented in APPENDIX A and are discussed at relevant points in the presentation of findings to follow.

The primary independent variable relates to previous participation in the migrant farm-labor force. Respondents were asked the following question: "Have you ever traveled away from home to do farm (ranch) work in another area or state?" Affirmative and negative responses were appropriately classified as indicative of either "migrant" or "non-migrant" status.

The operational definitions for aspiration and expectation involve long-term status projections (i.e., "... job do you really expect to have most of your life"). For aspiration, the stimulus questions emphasized "most desired" status attainment, while for expectation the respondent was guided toward a realistic appraisal of status attainment by such word elements as "really expect." In reference to both educational and occupational status projection specifications given by the respondents, the responses were initially coded into qualitative attainment types of status and then these were transformed into more inclusive SES type "level" categories (see APPENDIX A). Family status projections

were indicated by specific desires and expectations relative to age of marriage and number of children.

An indicator for valuation of life goals was available from an instrument that asked the respondent to rank seven normally desired life ends, including the status areas examined here, in terms of their relative importance to him or her.

The Study Population and Data Collection

Data were collected from a survey in the spring of 1973 among Mexican-American high school sophomores residing in three counties located in the border region of southern Texas.[7]

The towns (Asherton, Rio Grande City, Roma, San Isidro, and Zapata) in which students were surveyed exhibit several common characteristics: (1) numerically small populations in nonmetropolitan areas; (2) high proportions of poverty families (over 50 percent of the total); (3) extremely high proportions of Mexican-American residents (more than 95 percent of the total in each community) and (4) traditional Mexican-American political dominance. Because of the latter two factors, it must be stressed that the five communities are somewhat atypical in comparison to other South Texas towns. Most cities throughout the region contain proportionately fewer Mexican-American residents and have tended to be politically and economically dominated by Anglos. Thus, interethnic prejudice and discrimination probably has been of considerably less magnitude in the study communities than in most other cities.

Questionnaires were group administered by research assistants to all sophomores present on the day of the survey in each school. Respondents were assured that their answers would be kept confidential. Each item was read aloud and

the students were given sufficient time for written response before going on to the next question. Approximately 80 percent of the sophomore enrollment participated in the survey. No attempt was made to interview those not present on the day of the interview. Most of the students interviewed identified themselves as Mexican Americans and only these respondents will be involved in this analysis (Table 1).

Table 1. High School Sophomores Interviewed in South Texas Study Area in 1973 by Ethnicity and Sex.

Ethnicity	Male	Female	Total
Mexican American	178	201	379
Anglo	15	15	30
Other	5	2	7
Total	198	218	416
No Response			3

Description of Sample: Migrants and Non-Migrants

This section is intended to provide a brief comparative description of migrants and non-migrants relative to several demographic and structural variables.

Sex. Of the 358 Mexican-American students responding to the migrant question, approximately one-third indicated previous participation in the migrant farm-labor force. However, migrant status was not evenly distributed by sex as significantly more males than females reported migrant experience (APPENDIX B, Table 1a). Further description was controlled by sex.

Age. Migrants tended to be slightly higher in mean ages than non-migrants (APPENDIX B, Table 1b). Discrepancies are somewhat more graphically revealed if we may assume that the "normal" age for high school sophomores is sixteen. Thus, 26 percent of migrant males and 21 percent of migrant females were seventeen years of age or over as compared with 9 percent of both non-migrant males and females.

School program. Migrants and non-migrants failed to significantly differ in a statistical sense in terms of reported school program (APPENDIX B, Table 1c). Surprisingly, however, a greater proportion of migrant males and females than non-migrants were enrolled in academic or college prep programs.

Socioeconomic status. Family SES was determined on the basis of the present occupation of the family's major money-earner.[8] As expected, those respondents reporting migrant participation were predominantly from low SES families (APPENDIX B, Table 1d).

Parents' origins. Parents' origins were tapped through an open-ended question asking the birthplaces of mothers and fathers. All parents were found to have been born either in Mexico or the United States. If one or both parents were indicated as having been born in Mexico, the response was coded as Mexican origin. Analysis revealed that proportionately more students reporting parents of Mexican as opposed to United States origin had been involved in the migrant work force (APPENDIX B, Table 1e). This finding was particularly striking among Mexican-American males.

General farm-labor force participation. Respondents were asked "Have you ever done or do you now do any farm (ranch) work for pay?" Of those indicating that they had worked for pay, the majority of both males and females were of migrant status (APPENDIX B, Table 1f). General farm work was strongly associated

with migrant participation among females particularly. On the other hand, among those reporting no paid farm work, 19 percent of the males and 13 percent of the females had been involved in the migrant force. This apparent paradox might be due (aside from measurement error) to the respondents accompanying their migrant families, but not working themselves, or performing farm work, but not receiving direct remuneration for it.

Analysis and Findings

Occupational Orientations

Aspirations. Significant statistical variation was not found between migrants and non-migrants (for both sexes) relative to occupational aspirations (Table 2). Majorities within all four groupings clearly aspired to high level occupations. Nonetheless, the proportion of respondents aspiring to such occupations was noticeably greater among non-migrants (males and females) than migrants.

Table 2. Migrant status by occupational aspirations.

Level of Aspiration	Males[1]		Females[2]	
	Migrants	Non-Migrants	Migrants	Non-Migrants
	---------- % ----------			
High	59	73	60	71
Intermediate	34	19	32	26
Low	7	8	9	4
Total	100%	100%	101%	101%
N	56	89	47	139
No Information	11	10	6	4
	1/ $x^2 = 4.08$		2/ $x^2 = 2.84$	
	df = 2		df = 2	
	p = .128		p = .240	

Expectations. In terms of job expectations, statistical significance was established for migrant status among females but not among males (Table 3). The expectations among female migrants were markedly lower than those for non-migrants. Indeed, proportionately twice as many female migrants as non-migrants expected to attain relatively low status occupations, and the reverse case was approximated in regard to high level jobs. As in the findings for aspirations, both male and female migrants projected lower expectations than their ethnic counterparts regarding the attainment of high status occupations. It should also be pointed out that fully one-third of the male migrants failed to respond to the question, which might be interpreted as being indicative of a lack of clarity or certainty about future jobs.

Table 3. Migrant status by occupational expectations.

Level of Expectation	Males[1]		Females[2]	
	Migrants	Non-Migrants	Migrants	Non-Migrants
	---------- % ----------		---------- % ----------	
High	58	68	30	58
Intermediate	27	25	39	27
Low	16	6	30	15
Total	101%	99%	99%	100%
N	45	79	46	122
No Information	22	20	7	17
	1/		2/	
	$X^2 = 3.04$		$X^2 = 11.01$	
	df = 2		df = 2	
	p = .217		p = .004	

Anticipatory goal deflection. Although statistical significance was only revealed again among females, general trends in terms of goal deflection were similar to those noted above (Table 4). Non-migrants were found to experience the least goal deflection. Positive deflection (i.e., expecting to attain a higher status job than that aspired to) was low across all groupings. However, negative deflection by sex was considerably greater among migrants; and regardless of migrant status, it was higher among females than males. Negative deflection was particularly pronounced among migrant females.

Table 4. Migrant status by occupational anticipatory goal deflection.

	Males[1]		Females[2]	
Goal Deflection	Migrants	Non-Migrants	Migrants	Non-Migrants
	%		%	
None	75	84	52	73
Positive	7	5	7	4
Negative	18	11	41	23
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	44	76	44	119
No Information	23	23	9	20
	1/		2/	
	$X^2 = 1.63$		$X^2 = 6.38$	
	df = 2		df = 2	
	p = .553		p = .040	

Educational Orientations

Aspirations. Analyses of migrant status by educational aspiration did not establish statistically significant variation (Table 5). Approximately similar majorities across all four groupings aspired to at least college graduation, although non-migrants tended toward college post-graduate work to a slightly greater extent than did migrants. Also, non-migrants tended to be somewhat more oriented toward post high school technical or vocational training and some college work. Conversely, 25 percent of the migrants (both sexes) did not aspire to post high school education.

Table 5. Migrant status by educational aspiration.

Level of Aspiration	Males[1] Migrants	Males[1] Non-Migrants	Females[2] Migrants	Females[2] Non-Migrants
	%		%	
College - Post Grad. Work	21 (51)	25 (51)	15 (51)	29 (53)
College Graduation	30	26	36	24
Some College or Tech. School	24 (24)	31 (31)	25 (25)	33 (33)
High School Grad.	22 (25)	16 (17)	23 (25)	14 (14)
Quit High School	3	1	2	0
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	67	99	53	139
No Information	0	0	0	0
	1/* $X^2 = 2.41$ df = 2 p = .299		2/* $X^2 = 4.24$ df = 2 p = .118	

*Chi Square tests were computed only for the collapsed three-level categories for which the percentages are in parentheses.

Expectations. High level expectations were consistent across all four groupings with the exception of migrant females (Table 6). Indeed, migrant females were conspicuous as a significant proportion (38 percent) did not expect to go beyond high school. Additionally, proportionately more migrant males in comparison to other males did not expect post high school education.

Table 6. Migrant status by educational expectation.

Level of Aspiration	Males[1] Migrants		Males[1] Non-Migrants		Females[2] Migrants		Females[2] Non-Migrants	
	%		%		%		%	
College - Post Grad. Work	9	(48)	20	(49)	6	(32)	17	(48)
College Graduation	39		29		26		31	
Some College or Tech. School	23	(23)	32	(32)	30	(30)	30	(30)
High School Grad.	24	(29)	18	(18)	38	(38)	23	(23)
Quit High School	5		0		0		0	
Total	100%		99%		100%		101%	
N	66		99		53		138	
No Information	1		0		0		1	
	1/* $x^2 = 4.05$ df = 2 p = .130				2/* $x^2 = 6.88$ df = 2 p = .031			

*Chi Square tests were computed only for the collapsed three-level categories.

Anticipatory goal deflection. Statistically significant differences relative to goal deflection were not revealed (Table 7). The majority of respondents across all groupings experienced no goal deflection. Perhaps the most noteworthy difference was found in terms of negative deflection by sex: females (regardless of migrant status) reported slightly more negative deflection than did males.

Table 7. Migrant status by educational anticipatory goal deflection

Goal Deflection	Males[1]		Females[2]	
	Migrants	Non-Migrants	Migrants	Non-Migrants
None	73	73	69	63
Positive	6	10	4	8
Negative	21	16	27	29
Total	100%	99%	100%	100%
N	66	98	52	138
No Information	1	1	1	1
	1/		2/	
	$X^2 = 1.31$		$X^2 = 1.22$	
	df = 2		df = 2	
	p = .524		p = .548	

Marriage and Procreation Orientations

Age at marriage. No marked differences between migrants and non-migrants were found regarding the ages at which they desired to get married (Table 8) or the expected ages at marriage (Table 9). The most prominent difference was sex-related: most males desired and expected marriage after 22, while most females wanted to and believed they would marry before that age.

Table 8. Migrant status by desired age at marriage.

Age Level	Males[1]		Females[2]	
	Migrants	Non-Migrants	Migrants	Non-Migrants
	%		%	
19 years and below	6	8	17	16
20-22 years	43	31	53	55
23 years and above	51	61	30	29
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	63	99	53	139
No Information	4	0	0	0

1/ $X^2 = 2.24$, df = 2, p = .326

2/ $X^2 = .06$, df = 2, p = .970

Table 9. Migrant status by expected age at marriage.

Age Level	Males[1]		Females[2]	
	Migrants	Non-Migrants	Migrants	Non-Migrants
	%		%	
19 years and below	8	9	17	19
20-22 years	40	32	56	56
23 years and above	50	60	27	25
Total	98%	101%	100%	100%
N	62	97	52	137
No Information	5	2	1	2

1/ $X^2 = 1.44$, df = 2, p = .508

2/ $X^2 = .12$, df = 2, p = .941

Number of children. Only among males were statistically significant differences observed for desired number of children (Table 10), and anticipated number of children (Table 11). Approximately twice as many male migrants as opposed to non-migrants and females in general desired and expected to have a large number (5 or more) of children.

Table 10. Migrant status by number of children desired.

Number of Children Desired	Males[1]		Females[2]	
	Migrants	Non-Migrants	Migrants	Non-Migrants
	%		%	
Small (0-2)	29	30	43	39
Average (3-4)	32	51	42	45
Large (5 or more)	40	19	17	16
Total	101%	100%	102%	100%
N	63	99	53	137
No Information	4	0	0	2

1/ $X^2 = 9.13$, df = 2, p = .010

2/ $X^2 = .34$, df = 2, p = .844

Table 11. Migrant status by number of children expected.

Number of Children Expected	Males[1]		Females[2]	
	Migrants	Non-Migrants	Migrants	Non-Migrants
Small (0-2)	23	38	31	35
Average (3-4)	34	38	52	42
Large (5 or more)	43	24	17	23
Total	100	100	100	100
N	61	98	48	155
No Information	6	1	5	4

1/ $X^2 = 6.61$, df = 2, p = .035

2/ $X^2 = 1.56$, df = 2, p = .537

Life Goal Valuations

Migrants and non-migrants were not found to differ overall in their orientations toward a variety of life goals (Table 12). Majorities within both groups designated education and job as the most important goals to attain. Money, material objects, place of residence, starting a family, and free time all received considerably less valuation. While goal differences between migrants and non-migrants tended to be minimal, variations by sex appeared to be slightly more pronounced (see valuations relative to education and money, for example).

Table 12. Migrant status by life goal valuation.

	Free Time		Education		Money		Job	
	Migrants	Non-Migrants	Migrants	Non-Migrants	Migrants	Non-Migrants	Migrants	Non-Migrants
Males	15%	15%	63%	59%	22%	33%	54%	64%
High Value								
Females	8%	4%	81%	89%	11%	7%	68%	76%
Males	61%	63%	15%	8%	19%	7%	5%	2%
Low Value								
Females	62%	71%	4%	0%	6%	9%	2%	3%

Table 12. (Continued).

	Place		Material		Family	
	Migrants	Non-Migrants	Migrants	Non-Migrants	Migrants	Non-Migrants
Males	8%	9%	18%	8%	16%	12%
High Value						
Females	6%	6%	11%	4%	8%	10%
Males	24%	29%	30%	38%	45%	50%
Low Value						
Females	11%	22%	38%	35%	66%	53%

Status and Familial Orientations Controlled by SES

Given that mobility and familial orientations usually tend to vary by socioeconomic status, it was decided to place limited controls for SES on migrant status. Respondents' SES was calculated on the basis of the occupation of the family's major money-earner. Due to an extremely skewed occupational distribution, responses were categorized as either High (professional, managerial, official, glamour, clerical, sales, skilled worker) or Low (operative, laborer, domestic). Students failing to respond to this question were given SES ranking on the basis of the reported educational level of father (High - some high school or above; Low - eighth grade or less). Few migrants were found within the high SES category. Therefore, complete controls for SES were precluded, and only those respondents of low SES were retained for this phase.

Generally, the trends noted above relative to occupational, educational, and familial orientations were duplicated within the low SES sub-sample. The occupational expectations of female migrants remained considerably lower than that of non-migrants (APPENDIX C, Table 1b), but also differences in job aspirations became statistically significant (APPENDIX C, TABLE 1a). And, negative anticipatory deflection among migrant females continued to be markedly higher than that for non-migrants (APPENDIX C, Table 1c). In terms of educational aspirations, migrants (both sexes), to a slightly greater extent, still tended to desire less post high school education (not statistically significant, APPENDIX C, Table 2a). Migrant females continued to express inordinately low expectations for attainment beyond high school (APPENDIX C, Table 2b). And although the effect of migrant status among males diminished somewhat regarding desired number of children (APPENDIX C, Table 3c), male migrants still clearly preferred larger families and expected larger families (APPENDIX C, Table 3d) than did others.

Summary and Conclusions

Relevant findings suggest that migrants and non-migrants do not significantly differ in terms of their level of aspiration toward occupation and education. Whether migrant or non-migrant, male or female, the majority of youths desired to complete college and to attain high status-level jobs. Also, regardless of migrant status and sex, most respondents experienced no anticipatory goal deflection, i.e., they expected to attain commensurate-level jobs and educations to which they aspired.

This is not to say, however, that all groupings expressed consistently optimistic perceptions of their futures. In this sense, migrant females appeared to be clearly set apart from other females and males in general. Female migrants reported job and schooling aspirations generally similar to those of the others. Nevertheless, in significant proportion, they believed that they would actually attain low-level occupations and receive no further formal education after high school. These findings continued to hold when only responses from low SES females were retained.

Relative to projections of age at marriage, migrant status did not appear as a significant differentiating factor. Rather, marital-age aspirations and expectations generally differed by sex: females expressing earlier ages, and males later ages for marriage.

Migrant status, however, did appear to be related to varying orientations among males toward procreation. A significantly greater proportion of migrant males than non-migrants desired and expected to father five or more children. Such differences were also maintained within the low SES control sample.

Finally, migrants and non-migrants did not noticeably differ from each

other in their rank valuations of life goals. Both groupings clearly valued education and occupation more than other goals such as money, material objects, and initiating a family.

We should stress that an important group has been omitted from the survey and subsequent analysis - the school dropouts. Previous research (Wages, 1971; Kuvlesky and Juarez, 1975) has noted that dropouts generally have lower status projections than those in school. And, given the typically disorganizing effects of migrant travel on schooling, it is probably safe to assume that the proportion of migrants and ex-migrants within the drop-out ranks is greater than that in the schools. This is not to say, however, that migrant status necessarily produces lowered aspirations and expectations - this is an empirical question. Migrant and non-migrant school dropouts may not differ at all in level of projection, as lowered projections would seem to be representative of "realistic" appraisals of future attainment and downward adjustments of aspiration in light of life situations among dropouts in general.

Although our data point to certain trends regarding orientational differences between migrants and non-migrants, we speculate that the differences probably would have been of greater magnitude given a stronger and more extensive indicator for migrant status. Clearly, the distinctions provided by the present indicator are gross: a stimulus question which evokes a simple "yes" or "no" answer can provide us with few insights into the problem. Indicators developed for future research should be constructed so as to tap a number of qualitative and quantitative dimensions of life experience within the migrant stream. Several aspects might be crucial for description and inference. First, length of involvement appears as a potentially crucial factor. We might logically hypothesize that the greater the length of experience, the greater the deviation from "mainstream" orientations. Another dimension requiring investigation is that of the currency

or period of involvement. Would the effects of present employment differ from those of previous participation, and if so, at what ages? And thirdly, an intergenerational biography which would tap the migrant participation of parents and grandparents seems particularly relevant. Indeed, such information would be necessary to assess the effects of transmitted migrant status on career goals and expectancies. Inclusion of other variables, such as place(s) of migration and participation in migrant-directed governmental programs, additionally might have analytical utility.

FOOTNOTES

1. See for instance a relatively recent description obtained from a synthesis of relevant research by Schnur (1970:1-5). A very excellent and comprehensive treatment of the relative deprivation of Mexican Americans as an ethnic grouping is provided in a recent book by Ellwyn Stoddard (1973). For a detailed discussion of educational problems of Mexican Americans, see Carter (1970, Chapter 1).

2. For a critical examination of the notion of a "culture of poverty," see Kutner (1975). For a reaction to the application of this idea to Mexican-American youth, see Kuvlesky and Juarez (1975) and to Mexican Americans in general, see Burma (1970:17-28).

3. For a rather detailed critical examination of how these notions operate within the institution of education, see Brischetto and Arciniega (1975). Also, see Kuvlesky and Juarez (1975: 243-247) for reference to other similar treatments of the subject.

4. See Schnur (1970:1-5), Rubel (1966), Madsen (1964: Chapter 4) and Burma (1970:17-20), among others.

5. This is an inference often drawn when a lower SES population is compared to a higher one. For a good example of the reasoning used here, see Hyman (1966). Yet, recent evidence indicates that this assumed positive relationship between SES and level of aspirations and expectations does not always hold (Kuvlesky and Edington, 1975).

6. We acknowledge the assistance of Juan Lugo in searching the literature. Neither he nor we could locate a single directly relevant published report of research, comparing migrant and nonmigrant Mexican-American youth on status projections.

7. For a more detailed discussion of the study areas, schools involved, and the respondents, see Kuvlesky and Monk (1975).

8. Due to an extremely skewed occupational distribution, responses were categorized as either <u>High</u> (professional, managerial, official, glamour, clerical, sales, skilled worker) or <u>Low</u> (operative, laborer, domestic). Students failing to respond to this question were given SES ranking on the basis of the reported educational level of father (High - some high school or above; Low - eighth grade or less).

APPENDIX A: INDICATORS AND MEASURES

Occupational Projections

Occupational aspirations were elicited from respondents with the open-ended question, "If you were completely free to choose any job, what would you most desire as a lifetime kind of work?" Responses were coded into a modified census classification of occupations which represents a heirarchy of occupational prestige as follows:

	Occupational Aspiration Types	Occupational Aspiration Levels[1]
1.	High Professional (doctor, lawyer, scientist)	High
2.	Low Professional (teacher, registered nurse)	
3.	Glamour (pro ball, pop singer, pilot)	
4.	Managerial (executive, run a store)	
5.	Clerical and Sales (typist, secretary)	Intermediate
6.	Skilled (carpenter, foreman, auto mechanic)	
7.	Operative (machine operator, bus driver)	Low
8.	Unskilled (waitress, farm worker)	
9.	Housewife	

Occupational expectations were elicited from responses to the following question: Sometimes we are not always able to do what we want most. What kind of job do you really expect to have most of your life?" Responses were coded exactly the same as for aspirations.

Educational Projections

Educational Aspiration

If you could have as much schooling as you desired, which of the following would you do? (Circle only one number):

1 Quit school right now.
2 Complete high school.
3 Complete a business, commercial, electronics, or some other technical program after finishing high school.
4 Graduate from junior college (2 years).
5 Graduate from a college or university.
6 Complete additional studies after graduating from a college or university.

Educational Expectation

What do you really expect to do about your education? (Circle only one number):

1 Quit school right now.
2 Complete high school.
3 Complete a business, commercial electronics, or some other technical program after finishing high school.
4 Graduate from a junior college (2 years).
5 Graduate from a college or university.
6 Complete additional studies after graduating from a college or university.

Marriage and Family Projections

An exact replica of the stimulus questions utilized to obtain responses on status projections related to family development (i.e., projected age of marriage and procreation (family size)) is presented below.

7. (a) Do you want to get married some day? (Circle one number):

1 Yes 2 No 3 Already married

If you answered yes, you want to get married, answer the following questions:

(b) At what age would you like to get married ☐

(c) How many children do you want? ☐

(d) How many children do you expect to have? ☐

(e) At what age do you really expect to get married? ☐

Valuation of Life Ends

"Listed below are a number of things that most young people look forward to. Rank them in order of their importance to you. For the one you think is most important, check number 1 in front of it; for the next most important one, check number 2, and so on until you have a number checked for each one. Read over the entire list before answering the question. (Check only one number beside each sentence and check each different number only once).

Order of importance to you

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Having lots of free time to do what I want
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	To develop my mind and get all the education I want
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	To earn as much money as I can
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Getting the job I want most
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Living in the kind of place I like best
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Having the kind of house, car, furniture, and other things like this I want
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	To get married and raise a family

CHECK YOUR ANSWER! You should have each number checked only once and a single number should be checked for each statement.

This operation produces a scale of valuation (rankings) ranging from 1 to 7. These were then grouped into "levels of valuation" categories as follows:

High	(1,2)
Intermediate	(3,4,5)
Low	(6,7)

A test-retest reliability check indicates that the broader "level categories have greater reliability than the initial specific rank scores (Kuvlesky and Lever, 1975).

APPENDIX B

Table 1a. Migrant status by sex.

Status	Males	Females
Migrants	40% (67)	28% (53)
Non-Migrants	60% (99)	72% (139)
Total	100% (166)	100% (192)

$X^2 = 5.9$ $p = .01$

Table 1b. Migrant status by age.

Age	Males		Females	
	Migrants	Non-Migrants	Migrants	Non-Migrants
	%		%	
14	0	8	11	9
15	34	41	28	42
16	40	42	40	41
17	21	7	17	7
18	3	2	4	2
19	2	0	0	0
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	67	98	53	139
No Information	0	1	0	0
Mean Age	15.9	15.5	15.8	15.7
Median Age	16	16	16	15
Mode	16	16	16	15

Table 1c. Migrant status by school program.

School Program	Males[1]		Females[2]	
	Migrants	Non-Migrants	Migrants	Non-Migrants
	---------- % ----------			
Academic	41	35	37	26
General	36	39	41	59
Vocational	23	26	22	15
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	64	92	51	127
No Information	3	7	2	12

1/ $X^2 = .55$, df = 2, p = .763

2/ $X^2 = 4.68$, df = 2, p = .094

Table 1d. Migrant status by family SES.

Status	High SES	Low SES
	---- % ---	--- % ---
Males		
Migrants	25	51
Non-Migrants	75	49
Total	100%	100%
N	67	99
Females		
Migrants	15	33
Non-Migrants	85	67
Total	100%	100%
N	59	132

Table 1e. Migrant status by parent's origins.

Status	Parent's Origins	
	Mexico	United States
Males		
Migrants	60%	30%
Non-Migrants	40%	70%
Total	100%	100%
N	42	109
Females		
Migrants	35%	23%
Non-Migrants	65%	77%
Total	100%	100%
N	54	129

Table 1f. Migrant status by general farm labor force participation.

Status	General Farm Work	
	Yes	No
	-----%----	-----%----
Males		
Migrants	58	19
Non-Migrants	42	81
Total	100%	100%
N	85	74
Females		
Migrants	93	13
Non-Migrants	7	87
Total	100%	100%
N	27	155

APPENDIX C

Table 1a. Migrant status by occupational aspiration - low SES.

Level of Aspiration	Males[1]		Females[2]	
	Migrants	Non-Migrants	Migrants	Non-Migrants
	%		%	
High	60	58	61	69
Intermediate	35	28	29	31
Low	5	14	11	0
Total	100%	100%	101%	100%
N	40	43	38	88
No Information	10	6	5	1
	1/		2/	
	$X^2 = 2.07$		$X^2 = 9.6$	
	df = 2		df = 2	
	p = .356		p = .008	

Table 1b. Migrant status by occupational expectation - low SES.

Level of Expectation	Males[1]		Females[2]	
	Migrants	Non-Migrants	Migrants	Non-Migrants
	%		%	
High	61	58	32	53
Intermediate	29	36	41	32
Low	10	6	27	14
Total	100%	100%	100%	99%
N	31	36	37	77
No Information	19	13	6	12

1/ $X^2 = .66$, df = 2, p = .724

2/ $X^2 = 5$, df = 2, p = .080

Table 1c. Migrant status by occupational anticipatory goal deflection - low SES.

Goal Deflection	Males[1]		Females[2]	
	Migrants	Non-Migrants	Migrants	Non-Migrants
	%		%	
None	80	79	56	70
Positive	6	12	5	4
Negative	13	9	39	26
Total	99%	100%	100%	100%
N	30	34	36	76
No Information	20	15	7	13

1/ $x^2 = .74$, df = 2, p = .696

2/ $x^2 = 2.17$, df = 2, p = .338

Table 2a. Migrant status by educational aspiration - low SES.

Level of Aspiration	Males[1]		Females[2]	
	Migrants	Non-Migrants	Migrants	Non-Migrants
	%		%	
College - Post Grad. Work	18	20	10	28
	(46)	(45)	(46)	(49)
College Graduation	28	25	36	21
Some College or Tech. School	26 (26)	37 (37)	29 (29)	38 (38)
High School Graduation	26	18	26	12
	(28)	(18)	(26)	(12)
Quit High School	2	0	0	0
Total	100%	100%	101%	100%
N	50	49	42	89
No Information	0	0	1	0
	1/ $X^2 = 1.91$, df = 2, p = .612		2/ $X^2 = 4.11$, df = 2, p = .126	

Table 2b. Migrant status by educational expectation - low SES.

Level of Expectation	Males[1]		Females[2]	
	Migrants	Non-Migrants	Migrants	Non-Migrants
	%		%	
College - Post Grad. Work	6	20	2	12
	(44)	(40)	(30)	(41)
College Graduation	38	20	28	29
Some College or Tech. School	22 (22)	33 (33)	30 (30)	35 (35)
High School Graduation	30	27	40	24
	(34)	(27)	(40)	(24)
Quit High School	1	0	0	0
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	50	49	43	89
No Information	0	0	0	0

1/ $X^2 = 1.54$, df = 2, p = .532

2/ $X^2 = 3.73$, df = 2, p = .153

Table 2c. Migrant status by educational anticipatory goal deflection - low SES.

	Males[1]		Females[2]	
Goal Deflection	Migrants	Non-Migrants	Migrants	Non-Migrants
None	74	73	71	61
Positive	4	10	5	7
Negative	22	16	24	33
Total	100%	99%	100%	101%
N	50	49	42	89
No Information	0	0	1	0

1/ $X^2 = 1.76$, df = 2, p = .582

2/ $X^2 = 1.44$, df = 2, p = .508

Table 3a. Migrant status by desired age of marriage - low SES.

Age Level	Males[1]		Females[2]	
	Migrants	Non-Migrants	Migrants	Non-Migrants
	%			
19 years and below	2	10	14	17
20-22 years	48	33	58	58
23 years and above	50	57	28	25
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	46	49	43	89
No Information	4	0	0	0

1/ $x^2 = 4.01$, df = 2, p = .132

2/ $x^2 = .27$, df = 2, p = .873

Table 3b. Migrant status by expected age at marriage - low SES.

Age Level	Males[1]		Females[2]	
	Migrants	Non-Migrants	Migrants	Non-Migrants
	%		%	
19 years and below	7	13	17	18
20-22 years	43	31	60	61
23 years and above	50	56	24	21
Total	100%	100%	101%	100%
N	44	48	42	87
No Information	6	1	1	2

1/ $x^2 = 1.81$, df = 2, p = .592

2/ $x^2 = .18$, df = 2, p = .913

Table 3c. Migrant status by number of children desired - low SES.

Number of Children Desired	Males[1]		Females[2]	
	Migrants	Non-Migrants	Migrants	Non-Migrants
	%		%	
Small (0-2)	32	35	40	38
Average (3-4)	30	41	42	43
Large (5 or more)	38	24	18	19
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	47	49	43	88
No Information	3	0	0	1

1/ $x^2 = 2.34$, df = 2, p = .310

2/ $x^2 = .05$, df = 2, p = .975

Table 3d. Migrant status by number of children expected - low SES.

Number of Children Expected	Males[1]		Females[2]	
	Migrants	Non-Migrants	Migrants	Non-Migrants
	%		%	
Small (0-2)	26	43	26	37
Average (3-4)	30	33	58	36
Large (5 or more)	44	24	16	27
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	46	49	38	86
No Information	4	0	5	3

1/ $x^2 = 4.5$, df = 2, p = .103

2/ $x^2 = 5.22$, df = 2, p = .072

REFERENCES

Brischetto, Robert and Arciniega, Thomas.
1973 "Examining the Examiners: A Look at Educator's Perspectives on the Chicano Student." Pp. 23-42 in Rudolph O. de la Garza, Z. Anthony Kruszewski and Tomas A. Arciniega (eds.) Chicanos and Native Americans: The Territorial Minorities. Englewood Cliffs. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Burma, John H. (ed.).
1970 Mexican-Americans in the United States. New York, N. Y.: Harper and Row, Publishers.

Carter, Thomas P.
1970 Mexican Americans in School: A History of Educational Neglect. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Crawford, Harold B.
1975 Educational and Occupational Aspirations and Expectations of Galveston High School Students. D.Ed. dissertation in Educational Administration, New Mexico State University, May.

Edington, Everett D., Timothy J. Pettibone, and Jane E. Heldt
1975 Educational, Occupational and Residence Aspirations and Expectations for Rural and Minority Youth in New Mexico. Las Cruces, N. M.: New Mexico State University, Department of Educational Administration, December.

Hyman, Herbert H.
1966 "The Value Systems of Different Classes: A Social Psychological Contribution to the Analysis of Stratification," in Reinhart Bendix and Seymour N. Lipset (eds.) Class, Status and Power: Social Stratification in Comparative Perspective. Second edition. New York: The Free Press. Pp. 488-99.

Kutner, Nancy G.
1975. "An Interethnic and Place of Residence Examination of the 'Culture of Poverty.' " Texas A&M University, Department of Rural Sociology. Departmental Technical Report Number 75-3. February.

Kuvlesky, William P. and Robert C. Bealer
1966 "A Clarification of the Concept 'Occupational Choice.' " Rural Sociology 31 (September):265-76.

Kuvlesky, William P. and Everett D. Edington
1976 "Ethnic Group Identity and Occupational Status Projections of Teenage Boys and Girls: Mexican American, Black, Native American, and Anglo Youth." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Southwestern Sociological Association, Dallas, Texas. April.

Kuvlesky, William P. and Rumaldo Z. Juarez
1975 "Mexican American Youth and the American Dream." Pp. 241-296 in J. Steven Picou and Robert E. Campbell (eds.) Career Behavior of Special Groups. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.

Kuvlesky, William P. and Philip M. Monk
1975 "Historical Change in Status Aspirations and Expectations of Mexican American Youth from the Border Area of Texas: 1967-1973." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Southwestern Sociological Association, San Antonio, March 27.

Kuvlesky, William P. and George W. Ohlendorf
1968 "Racial Differences in the Educational Orientations of Rural Youth." Social Science Quarterly 49 (September):274-283.

Kuvlesky, William P. and Katheryn A. Thomas
1971 "Social Ambitions of Negro Boys and Girls from a Metropolitan Ghetto." Journal of Vocational Behavior 1 (April):177-178.

Kuvlesky, William P., Dave Wright and Rumaldo Z. Juarez
1971 "Status Projections and Ethnicity: A Comparison of Mexican American, Negro, and Anglo Youth." Journal of Vocational Behavior 1 (April): 137-151.

Madsen, William
1964 The Mexican-Americans of South Texas. New York, Chicago, et al.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Merton, Robert K.
1957 Social Theory and Social Structure. Revised Enlarged Edition. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe.

Miller, Michael V.
1976 "Mexican Americans, Chicanos, and Others: Ethnic Self-Identification and Selected Social Attributes of Rural Texas Youth." Rural Sociology, (Forthcoming) Summer.

Rubel, Arthur.
1966 Across the Tracks: Mexican Americans in a Texas City. Austin: Hogg Foundation for Mental Health.

Schnur, James O.
1970 "A Synthesis of Current Research in Migrant Education." Las Cruces, New Mexico: New Mexico State University. An ERIC-CRESS Publication. May.

Stephenson, R. M.
1957 "Mobility Orientations and Stratification of 1,000 Ninth Graders." American Sociological Review. 22:204-212.

Stoddard, Ellwyn R.
1973 Mexican Americans. New York: Random House.

Turner, Ralph H.
1964 The Social Context of Ambition. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing.

Wages, Sherry D.
1971 "Mexican-American Dropouts in the Valley: Their Reasons for Leaving School and Their Educational and Occupational Status Projections." Unpublished M.S. Thesis, Texas A&M University (August).